

PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS

moving physics forward

July 2015

APS Editorial Office
Editorial Director
Daniel T. Kulp

Physical Review Letters Staff
Editorial Board
Published Mastheads
Consulting Editor: Stanley G. Brown



Stanley received his Ph.D. in theoretical particle physics at the University of Pennsylvania, and held postdoctoral positions at Cornell, MIT, UCLA, and Stony Brook University. He has served as Editor of PRL and PRD and as Editorial Director of the American Physical Society. He currently works part-time as a Consulting Editor for PRL, mainly handling papers in cosmology and cosmic ray physics.

Come on Stanley, my friend, let's "move physics forward" as your logo claims!

Email discussion with the editor of Physical Review Letters on 2 January 2003 over the mechanism of gravity (see <http://vixra.org/abs/1305.0012> for brief summary or <http://vixra.org/abs/1111.0111> and related uploads to vixra for more detail). Notice that Stanley G. Brown, editor of PRL, makes a large number of unproved, misleading, speculative and false assertions in failing to publish the paper (which he falsely claims is speculative, suggesting he has not read it or checked the calculations made) and begins with the assertion that I have a doctorate, which is incorrect and proves that even my covering letter has not been read. Basically, he is engaging in hate mail, not objective scientific editing!

When you exclude all the incorrect statements made by Stanley G. Brown, you are left with merely "Physical Review Letters does not, in general, publish papers on alternatives to currently accepted theories ..." This tells you a lot about the stagnation of quantum gravity in "peer" reviewed journals since 2003. These people are proved ignorant by their replies, and do not even read the letters to see whether authors have a PhD or not. So, given that error, why trust their judgement to censor the paper itself? There was a further exchange of emails with the associate editor over a longer period, in which the associate editor correctly called the mechanism "an extremely non-standard theory", but it turned out that instead of praising the new idea for its accurate prediction of the amount of dark energy two years before observation, what he really meant was that he only wanted spin-2 superstring theories of the failed Edward Witten variety that did not predict the observed dark energy. For the text of the Stanley Brown (Physical Review Letters editor) misleading emails, see: <http://vixra.org/abs/1511.0036>